17

18

19

20

21

Page 687.

A. All right.

Q. And the last sentence of that first

paragraph says, these benefits are designed --

excuse me, are designated as SMW Plus benefits and 22

November 17, 2005

#### Chicago, IL

Page 76 Page 74 are not subject to any of the provisions outlined in that might be amended in the back, we speak of other 1 1 Article 5 hereof. services in several areas here under other hospital services and supplies, other services and supplies 3 Would that include the order of benefit and skilled. It seems as -- yeah, home healthcare 4 determination rules that is in Section 5C which 4 begins on Page 678? 5 speaks of it. I would assume that it would fall in 5 6 under that, again being Medicare-approved. 6 MS. CONNOLLY: You can unclip it if you 7 Q. So I'm sorry, just so that I'm clear, you 7 want. BY MR. CHRISTOFFERSON: said other hospital services under hospitalization, 8 8 other services under skilled nursing facility care? 9 Q. If that helps, that section actually 9 A. Uh-huh. 10 starts on Page 676 titled Section 5.17, Coordination 10 Q. And -of Benefits. 11 11 A. And supplies. 12 A. All right. They speak of it as Article 5, 12 and they're saying that's the same as Section 5. It Q. And supplies. And then supplies and other 13 13 services under home healthcare? would have been better if they would have put a page 14 14 A. Yes, as long as it's Medicare-approved. 15 number on that part. 15 But again, what you're speaking of is Q. Anything else? 16 16 A. Again, on 635, we speak of medical 17 benefits are not subject to any of the provisions 17 outlined in Article 5. So Article 5 speaks of major expenses, services and other -- well, services and 18 medical expense, so it would be separate of that I other services, in-home healthcare speaks of other 19 19 would say, again just the Medicare coverage and services. 20 20 everything doesn't relate to major medical to my So I would assume that's what it's 21 21 knowledge. 22 22 covering. Page 77 Page 75 Q. If you would, please turn to Page 651. 1 Q. I'm sorry, I didn't mean to make this a 1 2 A. 651? 2 confusing question, and probably it was. 3 Q. Please. 3 I just wanted to confirm that the A. I see back on 634 here it's speaking under coordination of benefits section, which is 4 4 hospice care of outpatient drugs and inpatient 5 Section 5.17, and it might help maybe to look at the 5 table of contents at the beginning where it lists 6 respite care. 7 7 the different articles, and that article -- that Okav. 651. 8 section comes under Article 5. I just wanted to 8 Q. Yes, 651. In the middle of the page under Part D where it says Enrollment in the Program, and 9 confirm that, in fact, that provision does not apply 9 there's a reference there to monthly contributions to the Supplemental Medicare Wraparound Plus 10 10 Program. I believe it's Section 5.7.7. in the last sentence. 11 11 12 A. Uh-huh. 12 A. Yeah, what I'm seeing there -- yeah, Q. Again, is that the contributions you everything in there refers to active in Article 5 13 13 testified to earlier of the subsidized and that I've seen so far. 14 14 nonsubsidized employees? Well, 5.11 talks of physical examination, 15 15 employees and retirees. It looks like we're 16 A. The same, yes. 16 Q. Could you just briefly turn back to starting -- Section 5.11 speaks of retirees.

20 (Pages 74 to 77)

Everything before that refers to actives.

coordination of benefits. In 5.18 under

So I would assume those sections. Again,

major medical is talked about in 5.16 and 5.17,

subrogation, I would say those are not under the

17

18

19

20

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

charges was a part of the jargon at that time, and

now it's allowable charges would be my thought.

Q. Do you know what it meant by in that

A. That to me would tell me that the high

BY MR. CHRISTOFFERSON:

sentence in most instances?

November 17, 2005

#### Chicago, IL

Page 80 Page 78 percent of those are paid. It gives them a leeway Medicare retirees would be my interpretation, 1 of a review process if they feel, you know, 2 probably just those ones that says retirees, 5.11, 2 typically cover yourself language as I would look at 3 3 5.12. it, so in most instances. 4 4 Does that answer your question? Again, I think this has been updated later 5 Q. Yes, thank you. 5 than this '93, and again, this is the pension fund 6 6 A. Okay. document, so I don't know what their intent was. 7 O. You can put that aside now. I'm done with 7 Q. So you wouldn't know specifically when or 8 that document for now. 8 9 why the Fund would not pay that 20 percent? 9 A. All right. A. Again, I think this statement is made by Q. If you would, please, turn to Exhibit 10 10 the pension people that didn't do the health and 11 Randle 005, and specifically, if you could turn to 11 Page SMW 0590. And if you could please look again 12 welfare, so they made it broad enough for the health 12 and welfare people to work within. This was just a at the second to the last sentence of the second 13 13 paragraph, it says, SMW Plus will pay the remaining 14 general description for the people. 15 Q. Just generally speaking, do you know what 20 percent of reasonable charges in most instances. 15 the differences are between the Wraparound Plus Do you see that? 16 16 Program as described in this 1993 summary as opposed A. Yes. 17 17 to what's described in the 2003 summary? O. Did I read that correctly? 18 18 A. Not item-by-item differences, no. A. Uh-huh. 19 19 O. Was the deductible the same in 1993 as it 20 Q. Again, do you know how Medicare 20 determined, quote, reasonable charges? 21 is currently under the program? 21 A. My recollection would be that it would be MS. CONNOLLY: Objection to form. 22 22 Page 81 Page 79 different. I think Medicare has changed that THE WITNESS: Do you want to restate? 1 through the years, and as we follow that, it's 2 BY MR. CHRISTOFFERSON: 2 evolved to whatever the Medicare. O. This section says that the Fund as we have 3 3 Q. And the Fund didn't require a deductible discussed will pay 20 percent --4 4 over and above the amount that Medicare required? 5 5 A. Uh-huh. A. To my knowledge, no. 6 Q. -- of what in the later summary Medicare 6 was allowable charges. 7 O. If you could please turn to Page 587. 7 There's a section, How Much Will SMW Plus Cost You. 8 A. Right. 8 9 A. Uh-huh. 9 O. And here it says -- and you testified earlier that you didn't know how Medicare determine \$10 Q. And there are some amounts listed and described in subsequent paragraphs. 11 what allowable charges were. 11 In this case, do you know how Medicare 12 Were these amounts analogous to the 12 determined what reasonable charges were? amounts we were discussing earlier just for a 13 13 MS. CONNOLLY: Objection to form. different time period, or are these amounts 14 14 referring to some other type of payment? THE WITNESS: I do not know. Of course, 15 15 MS. CONNOLLY: Objection to form. this being a '93 document, probably reasonable

21 (Pages 78 to 81)

THE WITNESS: Do you want to restate?

O. Yes. I'm just wondering whether, take,

national pension fund or local unions and council's

pension fund under an arrangement with the Sheet

for example, the first sentence, it says the

BY MR. CHRISTOFFERSON:

16

17

18

19

20

20

21

22

Medicare-approved. That's, you know, the starting

Q. If you would, staying on the same page,

basis for all of the payments.

November 17, 2005

### Chicago, IL

Page 82 Page 84 593, under the section How Are Benefits Paid, and Metal Workers National Health Fund is providing 1 1 specifically the second paragraph, that paragraph 2 SMW Plus at the low cost of \$26 per individual per 2 says, when you have expenses for which benefits are month, and you testified earlier that I believe 3 3 payable under Medicare, you will receive an subsidized, what you called subsidized employees 4 4 5 explanation of benefits, in parenthesis EOB, showing 5 were paying --6 what Medicare has paid toward those expenses. 6 A. 112. 7 O. -- 112. 7 Simply forward a copy of the EOB form to the national health fund office and keep the original 8 In 1993, was the payment that is now \$112, for your records, and you will receive a check for 9 was that \$26? 9 the 20 percent of the Medicare charge not paid by 10 10 A. The last one speaks to you and your spouse, and I think the coverage now is spouses Medicare if such charges are covered by SMW Plus. 11 11 12 Did I read that correctly? 12 included, and it's a set amount whether you have a 13 A. You did. 13 spouse or not. So I would say that \$52 amount is the one 14 Q. To your knowledge, is that the same 14 15 process that's in effect today? that aligns to the 112 moving forward to this time 15 A. The statement that says you will receive a period. And again, this is something that was laid 16 16 out by the pension people at that point. The 17 check, you know, is the only thing that concerns me. 17 I think we're paying directly to whomever, validity of it being correct, I can't attest to 18 18 physician, hospital, rather than to the person would 19 19 that. be my thought on that. 20 Q. If you could please turn to Page 593. I 20 guess to see the context, you should flip back to 21 Again, this is the pension fund's document, and probably what they meant is it will be 22 592 where it says what is not covered. Page 83 Page 85 1 paid for. 1 A. Uh-huh. 2 Q. And the last sentence of that first 2 Q. So currently it's your understanding the participants are not required to front the money to 3 3 paragraph says, no coverage under SMW Plus is 4 their provider but rather the Fund would pay the 4 provided for, and then there's a list of items that provider directly? 5 continue on to the next page. 5 6 A. That's right. 6 A. Uh-huh. O. And the last item is take-home 7 Q. Can a participant participate -- strike 7 8 8 prescription drugs. that. 9 Can an individual participate in the 9 A. Uh-huh. Supplemental Medicare Wraparound Plus Program if 10 Q. Is the coverage with respect to take-home 10 they have any additional insurance beyond Medicare 11 prescription drugs the same as it was -- excuse me. 11 In 1993, was it the same that it is 12 other than the Fund? 12 13 A. You know, there's a qualification for 13 currently? individuals to meet to participate. You know, in 14 A. To my knowledge, take-home prescription 14 most medical coverages to my knowledge, no one will drugs are still not covered, so it would align 15 itself apparently with this same statement. 16 be a part of paying more than 100 percent of 16 charges, and when that provider accepts Medicare, he 17 Q. Are there any other prescription drugs 17 gets paid 80 percent. The others, we, pay that are excluded from coverage? 18 18 19 20 percent. That's 100 percent paid. A. Again, it just falls back to 19

22 (Pages 82 to 85)

So, you know, was your question can he go

Q. Well, let's say, for example, the provider

out and buy and pay for other coverage?

20

21

November 17, 2005

#### Chicago, IL

Page 88 Page 86 knowledge that they do. charges an amount and Medicare approves an amount 1 1 Q. If you would, please, just quickly turn to 2 that's lower than what the provider charged because 2 for whatever reason the provider charged too much in 3 Exhibit Randle 003, which is the 2003 Summary Plan 3 4 Medicare's view. 4 Description. 5 A. From what I understand, Medicare has the 5 A. Uh-huh. 6 Q. And specifically Page SMW 0012. strong arm in that. They tell those providers what 6 7 7 A. All right. they can charge, you know. Q. And there's a section that says May I 8 I relate this to my parents, you know. I 8 9 followed through. They have supplemental insurance 9 Enroll in SMW Plus if I Am Covered Under a Nontraditional Medicare Plan. It says the first 10 with Bankers Life, you know. They say how much that 0 provider's original bill is, and then they say how 11 11 paragraph, the benefits provided under the SMW Plus much they are going to cover, and they will pay 12 program are offered as a supplement to standard 12 80 percent of that, and then this supplementary Medicare Part A and Part B benefits. If you are 13 13 insurance pays that 20 percent. 14 enrolled in a Medicare plus choice plan such as a 14 15 Medicare HMO, or if you change your coverage to such 15 So there's no -- the provider has to say he accepts Medicare before that person gets services a plan, you are not eligible for SMW Plus benefits. 16 16 17 Did I read that correctly? 17 from him is my understanding, so there's no --18 Q. So it's your understanding that the 18 A. Yeah. provider can never receive payment in excess of the 19 Q. Is it your understanding that this policy 19 total amount that Medicare approves? 20 is actually currently in place? 20 21 A. Yes. 21 MS. CONNOLLY: Objection to form. Sorry. THE WITNESS: The 100 percent -- restate 22 O. And is it your understanding that that 22 Page 87 Page 89 policy has been in place since the Wraparound Plus 1 that. 1 2 BY MR. CHRISTOFFERSON: 2 Program has been in existence or going back as far 3 3 Q. Am I understanding your testimony as you can? 4 correctly to be that the provider is only allowed to 4 A. Yeah. Now, how long has Medicare plus 5 5 charge what Medicare says is an allowable charge? choice plan and Medicare HMO been out there 6 available, I'm not sure. Our plan should have 6 A. That's my understanding. 7 MS. CONNOLLY: Same objection. 7 adopted that statement at the time they came out 8 BY MR. CHRISTOFFERSON: 8 because our administrator stays on top of every new 9 Q. Does the Fund keep track of whether any of 9 federal regulation and every new thing that comes 10 10

its participants have other insurance? And participants in the Medicare wraparound program.

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

A. I think the Fund monitors in case there is, you know, automobile insurance to subrogate against or, you know, any other insurance. Say a fellow is at a home of somebody and has an accident.15 It can be filed against that guy's homeowner policy. They monitor it from that standpoint, you know.

18 I'm sure they ask that question if they have got it. I think most forms when you fill them 19 out, that question I've seen as a part of it, so 20 21 from that standpoint, I'm sure their standard form

22 asks that question. But I don't have personal out.

So I'm sure that we have been following that since those would have come into existence.

Q. If you would, look at the second paragraph. The second sentence says, if you should join a Medicare plus choice plan, please contact the Fund office so that your coverage under this program can be terminated. If you incur claims and are enrolled under a Medicare plus choice plan, those claims will not be covered under SMW Plus.

19 20 Did I read that correctly?

21 A. Yes.

22 Q. Is it your understanding that the Fund

23 (Pages 86 to 89)

11

12

13

14

16

17

November 17, 2005

## Chicago, IL

Page 92 Page 90 sentence says, I have also been advised that some of 1 monitors whether its participants are enrolled in 1 2 other insurance plans such as Medicare plus choice 2 the Defendants were referred to as Track 1 3 Defendants and include the following manufacturers, 3 plans? MS. CONNOLLY: Objection to form. 4 Astro-Zeneca, Bristol-Myers Squibb, GlaxoSmithKline 4 5 and Johnson & Johnson. 5 You can answer. Did I read that correctly? 6 MR. CHRISTOFFERSON: Strike that. Let me 6 7 rephrase it. 7 A. Yes. BY MR. CHRISTOFFERSON: 8 8 Q. And then the paragraph goes on to say that portions of pharmaceutical bills were covered in the 9 Q. How does the Fund know whether its 9 10 participant is a member of a Medicare plus choice 10 first instance by the health fund -- excuse me, that the health fund paid for portions of pharmaceutical 11 plan or other insurance plan? 11 A. Again, any insurer that's not -- makes 12 bills that were covered in the first instance by 12 sure that there's nothing in excess of 100 percent Medicare Part B, numerous drugs fall into this 13 13 14 paid, so in that, assuming, you know, that the 14 category. After first learning of the provider would come back if a double payment has above-referenced action, the board of trustees 15 15 16 been made would be one method of checking that out 16 authorized Fund counsel to survey records of the 17 Now, whether they go to the trouble of 17 health fund to determine some of the drugs which asking before they send a payment, is this money 18 have been paid for by the health fund as a portion 18 still owed, you know, I'm sure they have some checks 19 of pharmaceutical bills that were covered in the 19 and balances for doing exactly that. I don't know 20 20 first instance by Medicare Part B and had been 21 what they would be, but as you work in this stuff 21 manufactured by Track 1 Defendants. The following day in and day out, I'm sure you find all those 22 drugs were identified as having been paid in this 22 Page 91 Page 93 methods of having that coverage or having that 1 category: Cytoxan, Etopophos, Kytril, Levaquin, 1 2 information to you. 2 Nevelbine, Paraplatin, Procrit, Remicade, Rubex, Q. Well, just to be a little bit more 3 Taxol, Vepesid and Zoladex. 3 4 Did I read that correctly? 4 specific, where it says that or where it appears to 5 be asking the participant to whom this summary is 5 A. To my knowledge, yes. Q. And is everything that I've just read, in directed to contact the Fund office in the event 6 6 7 that it joins a Medicare plus choice plan, is that 7 fact, true? 8 the way in which the Fund discovers whether any of 8 A. Yes. 9 its participants are enrolled in Medicare plus 9 Q. How do you know that the health fund paid choice plan? a portion of pharmaceutical bills that were covered 10 10 11 11 A. I'd say that would be the initial way, in the first instance by Medicare Part B? A. By review of claims paid. and, of course, there's a monthly correspondence on 12 12 that. I don't think, of course, logically anybody 13 Q. And who conducted that review? 13 14 A. Of course Southern Benefit Administrators would be paying for two of them, but I'm sure they 14 have some method of making sure of that. is involved in it, as they have the records. I 15 15 Q. Do you know who would know what these 16 think there was people involved in that process. I 16 17 various methods are? 17 don't know the exact details of how that was done as to who did it, but a sampling should have been done 18 A. Teresa Jernigan would be the person. 18 Q. You can set that aside for now. by the Southern Benefit Administrators, 19 19 20 If you would please turn back to your 20 Teresa Jernigan, her people. 21 affidavit, which is Exhibit Randle 002, and if you 21 Q. And is this the survey that you referred 22 would, please look at Paragraph 4. The second 22 to in that same paragraph?

24 (Pages 90 to 93)

November 17, 2005

#### Chicago, IL

7

8

9

11

12

13

15

16

17

20

4

5

6

7

8

9

11

12

13

14

15

16

Page 94

1 A. Refresh my memory.

Q. It says, after learning of the

3 above-referenced action, the board of trustees

authorized Fund counsel to survey records of the 4

5 health fund.

2

6

7

8

11

19

20

1

2

4

5

6

7

8

- A. Uh-huh.
  - Q. When was that survey commissioned?
- A. Basically as I signed this document,
- December the 14th of '04, would have been the 9 authorization to go forward with that, and Jan --10
  - Q. And what records were searched?
- A. Well, the claim file, all people situated 12
- in this coverage, and I think at that point in time 13
- did we have -- we didn't have a Massachusetts named 14 14
- situation. It was just all people that had claims 15
- for drugs, these drugs. 16
- 17 Q. And what was actually requested to be done in this survey? 18
  - MS. CONNOLLY: I'm just going to instruct you not to answer anything that you learned just by
- virtue of talking to either me or Jan. But you can 21
- 22 answer if you can answer outside of that.

Page 95

THE WITNESS: Uh-huh. State the question again.

#### 3 BY MR. CHRISTOFFERSON:

- Q. What was requested with respect to this survey? What were the instructions provided to I think you said Teresa Jernigan and the others at the third-party administrator in connection with this survey?
- 9 A. The instructions were to have claims 10 available for review.
- 11 Q. A review by whom?
- 12 A. You know, whomever is chosen to be the people that do that review, you know, that states 13 14 the drugs that were ones to be looked at.

15 So she was to pull the claim file of

- anyone that had those drugs involved in their claim. 16
- Q. And when you say those drugs, you mean the 17 17
- 18 drugs that are listed in Paragraph 4?
- 19 A. To my recollection, that's what they were 20 looking for.
- Q. Were there any other drugs they were 21 looking for? 22

Page 96

- A. I think, you know, in that process you're 1 2 going to see others. I'm not aware.
- 3 Q. That last sentence in that Paragraph 4 4 says, I am certain other drugs have been paid for in 5 similar fashion, and with more time the health fund 6 can determine the names of those drugs.

Did I read that correctly?

- A. Yes.
- Q. How are you certain that other drugs have been paid for in a similar fashion? 10
  - A. Just due to the nature of claims being paid for people throughout the United States with various conditions, you know. I would say a full scope of all drugs available out there in the marketplace are potentially there, logically there.
  - Q. Have you determined that other drugs were, in fact, covered in the first instance by Medicare Part B and were paid for by the Fund?
- 19 A. I personally have not determined that.
  - Q. What steps did you take to learn whether,
- in fact, that happened? 21
- 22 A. The process has been initiated. I think

Page 97

- it's still currently going, you know. I don't -- I 1 2 assume I'll have a report of that at the time it's 3 concluded.
  - Q. So you're still conducting this survey?
  - A. Yes. Yeah, as we're saying, in the filing that we had to file by date order, we're in the transition of the software, so it's a very laborious process.
- Q. And how long do you think your survey is going to take to complete? 10
  - A. My guess, since they're simultaneously getting this new software, would be another six, eight months possibly.
  - Q. If you could also just turn to Exhibit Randle 006, the billing records.
    - A. Uh-huh.
- Q. And I should state for the record so that it's clear that Plaintiffs have produced additional 18 19 documents other than those documents that are
- contained in this exhibit, and these are just 20
- 21 examples of those billing records, and if I should
- 22 state a question that requires reference to

25 (Pages 94 to 97)

November 17, 2005

Page 100

Page 101

#### Chicago, IL

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

Page 98 another -- to other records or if it's unclear what 1 2 I'm asking because these are only examples, please let me know, and I'll try to rephrase the question. 3 A. All right. 4 5 Q. Excuse me. 6 A. Let me have another break before we get 7 into that. 8 MR. CHRISTOFFERSON: Absolutely. 9 (Whereupon, a short recess was 10 taken.) BY MR. CHRISTOFFERSON: 11 Q. Mr. Randle, if you would, just please turn 12 back to Exhibit Randle 004 and Page 701, SMW 701, and 13 14 this appears to be an amendment, Section 3.4, summary of schedule of benefits for optional employees 15 15 described under Section 4.15 who are eligible to 16 16 17 enroll for Medicare benefits and any of their 17 eligible dependents who are eligible to enroll for 18 Medicare benefits. 19 20 A. Uh-huh. 21 Q. And then on the next page under medical 22 benefits, it says, the Fund will pay major medical

people. There was some exclusion when you reached eligibility for Medicare coverage. Whether it was truly just the contractor or contractor and optional employees, I just feel that that happened, but here at this time, yes.

- Q. So at least as of the 2nd of October, 2002, the Fund was providing Medicare benefits --
- A. Uh-huh.
- 9 Q. -- to optional employees? Thank you. 10 Just getting back to again your affidavit, you can set that aside, you mentioned that as a 11 12 result of the survey that is still ongoing of the Fund's records that you hoped to get a report at 13 14 some point?
  - A. Well, I'm one of those micromanagers, so I generally like to have an idea of what's going on on anything that I'm involved in, so yeah, I'll be asking for an update.
- Q. With respect to the drugs that are 19 identified in Paragraph 4, did you receive a report 20 that indicated that those drugs were among those that the Fund had provided reimbursement for under

Page 99

1

6

7

15

expense benefits for charges approved by Medicare but not paid by Medicare. These will generally include, and then it goes on to say among other things Part B deductible and Part B copayments.

Did I read that correctly?

A. Yes.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

16

- Q. And then the last page of that amendment appears to be the next page, 703, and is that your signature that appears on that page?
  - A. Yes.
- 11 Q. And is the date that I'm reading correctly the 2nd day of October, 2002? 12
- A. Yes. 13
- 14 Q. So as of 2002, was the Fund providing Medicare benefits to optional employees? 15
  - A. It appears from this that they were.
- 17 Q. Does that refresh your recollection as to whether the Fund is currently providing such 18

benefits? 19

20 A. I still maintain that we dropped the optional. Now, you know, it could be just the 21 contractors ourselves rather than the optional 22

the Wraparound Plus Program?

A. That was the initial question, you know, 2 did we have people with this usage of these drugs, 3 and the report that I verbally got back was that 4

5 there were people.

- Q. And how did you learn that?
  - A. Through conversation.
- Q. With whom? 8
- 9 A. It might have been Jan and I. It might have been Lynn Brassel. I don't recall for sure
- who, but there was a conversation that there was 11 those drugs paid for for the SMW Plus people. 12
- Q. And do you know specifically how those 13 drugs were identified? 14
  - A. Through the claim forms review.
- 16 Q. Have you determined that as of today that 17 other drugs covered in the first instance by

Medicare Part B were paid for by the Fund? 18

- A. I personally have not looked at the 19
- records and have that knowledge, but, you know, I 20
- 21 guess thinking of the process and the people 22

involved and everything that logically probably

26 (Pages 98 to 101)

22

that standpoint, yes.

November 17, 2005

### Chicago, IL

Page 102 Page 104 State the question again. every drug out there, you know, would have some 1 1 2 Q. Are these examples of the types of records 2 coverage, use by our participants. Q. What steps did you take to learn the 3 that the Fund and the plan administrator for the 3 Fund maintain with respect to the claims that the current results of your survey? 4 4 A. Well, there hasn't been any results other Fund has paid? 5 5 6 6 than the fact that, you know, certain drugs have A. Yes, to my knowledge, yes. 7 been used by participants. 7 Q. And again, I would represent that Plaintiffs have produced records comprising the 8 Q. Have you identified any drugs manufactured by Schering-Plough or Warrick Pharmaceuticals? Bates range of SMW 0034 through SMW 580, but all 9 that is marked in this particular exhibit is through A. I have not gotten into that deep of detail 10 10 SMW 0084. 11 in any report. 11 Q. So the Fund has not identified any 12 A. Uh-huh, yes. 12 O. How were these records compiled for Schering-Plough or Warrick drugs? 13 13 A. Well, it's very possible and likely that 14 production? 14 A. For production? they have. The report back to me has not identified 15 15 O. In this litigation. particular manufacturers or, you know, just the fact 16 16 that drugs had been used by the participants fell in 17 A. Well, they're filed chronologically in 17 their current state, and they will be accumulating the class. 18 18 them by state. In particular Massachusetts at this Q. In preparation for your deposition today, 19 19 did you ask anyone what the current status of that point will be their target. 20 20 survey of these records is? 21 Q. Have any records to your knowledge been 21 22 produced reflecting payment to a provider, medical A. Yes, I've visited with Teresa to -- not 22 Page 105 Page 103 services provider based in Massachusetts? Teresa. Sharon Faulkner is the lady that heads up 2 2 this software conversion, and she told me that it A. My understanding is yes, that they have. Q. And just to clarify, it's your 3 was ongoing and that this information would be more 3 understanding that those have not only been located, easily obtained in that conversion that they're 4 4 they have been produced to the Defendants? 5 doing. 5 A. Located I've been told, you know. 6 Q. And did Ms. Faulkner or anyone else tell 6 7 you that the Fund has identified any drugs 7 Produced, I don't know personally. manufactured by Schering-Plough or Warrick MR. CHRISTOFFERSON: Just for the record. 8 8 to the extent that there are records that have been 9 Pharmaceuticals? 9 A. No, we didn't have that discussion in that located with respect to providers based in 10 10 Massachusetts, we would request those to be 11 detail. 11 Q. If you could, please turn to Exhibit Randle 12 produced. 12 13 006. 13 THE WITNESS: That's the intention. You testified earlier that the Fund MS. CONNOLLY: You'll get them as we get 14 14 through the plan administrator maintains records of 15 them. 15 16 the claims that it pays under the Wraparound Plus 16 THE WITNESS: Uh-huh. Program? 17 17 BY MR. CHRISTOFFERSON: A. Yes. 18 Q. And these records are kept with the 18 19 Q. Are these examples of those records? 19 third-party administrator? A. To the best of my knowledge. I see them A. In Goodlettsville. 20 20 21 identified as retired sheet metal workers, so from 21 Q. In Goodlettsville.

27 (Pages 102 to 105)

A. I think they have a professional group

November 17, 2005

# Chicago, IL

Page 108 Page 106 that storage wise takes care of them warehouse wise 1 Q. And so let's just deal with those 1 2 2 Q. Mr. Randle, I'm not going to go through every one of these records because we would be here 3 Do you know who created the form itself? 3 A. The blank form? for weeks, but if you could please just turn to 4 4 Page SMW 0040, Page 40. I see this label is 5 O. The blank form. 5 actually up a little bit on the page, so it might be 6 A. That would be our third-party 6 7 administrator I would say would be -- well, of 7 difficult to find. course, it states down here it's been approved by 8 8 A. All right, uh-huh. the AMA Council on Medical Services, so it might be 9 Q. Do you recognize this document that's on 9 a stock form that they buy. 10 this page? 10 Q. If you would, just try to perhaps help A. I think this is the same document that 11 11 refresh your recollection, if you look at the bottom I've seen in the past that has the form to be used 12 12 of this, the very bottom underneath where actually 13 and the claim form. 13 the form stops and you see some writing on the 14 Q. So you don't obviously recognize this right-hand lower corner that says Form HCFA-1500. 15 particular --15 A. Uh-huh. 16 A. No. 16 O. And then Form RRB-1500 and then 17 Q. -- form? 17 Form OWCP-1500. But you recognize the general form that 18 18 this appears on? 19 A. I see that. 19 A. Uh-huh. Q. Does that help at all refresh your 20 20 21 recollection as to who created this form? 21 O. What is this document, the form? A. Just a health insurance claim form. 22 A. HCFA, you know, not knowing what that 22 Page 109 Page 107 O. And who creates this document? stands for, again, my assumption would be that it's 1 a standard form that's out in the industry, health 2 A. I would assume that it's created in 2 Goodlettsville by the claims payor, you know. There 3 claim industry. 3 Q. Would it refresh your recollection if I would be an initiation of this form from the 4 participant information wise, and I guess that is 5 represented to you that this is a form that's 5 generated by the federal government as opposed to what we stated earlier came from Medicare, so it was 6 6 7 7 a matter of those people getting their Medicare your third-party administrator? A. Yeah. Well, that's what would stand to statement coupling it with probably this claim form 8 8 as a cover sheet for that. 9 reason as it has the AMA Council approval, and 9 everything that would be done by them would probably 10 10 So, you know, I'm sure the participants are not typing this thing out, so I would assume be a federal agency. 11 11 that that would have been by it appears the same 12 Q. And turning to the information that has 12 machine produced print wise that put the sheet metal been entered onto this form, who or what is 13 13 Goodlettsville, Tennessee address at the top, so I responsible for entering the information onto this 14 15 form? would assume that they produced it there from the 15 16 information sent to them. 16 A. Well, as I look at it, it's very possible it came from the physician, his office, you know. 17 Q. Let me just clarify. Perhaps my question 17 wasn't clear. I think my question was unclear. The original information would obviously had to have 18 18 On this document, there is a form, and 19 come from them and the coding that's done or the 19 procedures that were done, because all of that is 20 then someone or something typed information into 20 reviewed in the process by Medicare, so I would 21 this form. 21 assume the physician, their people in the office did 22 A. Uh-huh. 22

28 (Pages 106 to 109)

November 17, 2005

### Chicago, IL

Page 110 Page 112 detail to understand for sure. There's a net 1 it. 1 2 Q. And if you would, could you just please 2 amount, so I assume, you know, it shows the total look at the column in the bottom section that says 3 3 claim and net amount that's paid. procedures, services or supplies. So it would be some kind of summary of the 4 4 5 A. Uh-huh. 5 doctor's charges. O. And then there's a column that's headed 6 6 Q. Do you see at the top there are some 7 CPT/HCPCS. 7 columns listed, and it appears that a section of 8 A. Uh-huh. 8 this was redacted, but it appears that these columns 9 Q. And there are some numbers that appear in run down through the page, and it says among other 9 10 10 that column. things there's a column that says P-R-O-C --11 Do you see where there's an entry that 11 A. Uh-huh. says J9096? Q. -- at the top. 12 12 13 A. Yes. 13 Do you know what that column means? 14 Q. Do you know what that refers to? 14 A. I don't. 15 15 A. No. Q. Do you know what the column billed means 16 Q. Do you know what any of these codes refer 16 A. It would stand to reason it is the amount 17 to? 17 the physician has billed for these various codes. 18 A. Not personally I don't, but it stands to 18 Q. And just as an example, if you follow that reason again it's a standard coding in the business, 19 19 column down, the second entry there says 75. so to speak. I'm sure it's aligned with Medicare 20 20 Is that \$75 under that billed amount? 21 coding. 21 A. Billed amount, I would assume it is. 22 Q. With respect to the codes that began with 22 Q. And then the next column over says Page 111 Page 113 a J -- well, strike that. 1 1 allowed. 2 Is there anything on this form that 2 A. Right. indicates what prescription drug was administered by 3 Q. Do you know what that means? 3 the physician? 4 A. I would say that that's Medicare's allowed 5 MS. CONNOLLY: Objection, form. 5 amount. 6 You can answer. 6 Q. And with respect to that same entry, is 7 THE WITNESS: In that column D, it states 7 that \$48.86? procedures, services, supplies. 8 8 A. Yes. 9 BY MR. CHRISTOFFERSON: 9 Q. And then there is a column two over that 10 Q. If you would turn to Page 42, two pages 10 says C-O-I-N-S. ahead of that. 11 11 Do you know what that means? 12 Do you recognize this document or this 12 A. Coinsurance, I would assume. type of document? 13 13 Q. And that value in that same entry is 14 A. No, not personally I don't. 14 \$9.77? Q. Do you know who creates this document? 15 15 A. Which appears to be about 20 percent of A. No, I don't. Of course, at the top 16 16 the 48.86. right-hand corner it says Medicare Remittance 17 17 Q. Is that the amount that the Fund paid Notice, so I assume Medicare. 18 18 through the Wraparound Plus Program for that 19 Q. Do you know what this document is used 19 particular entry? for? 20 20 MS. CONNOLLY: Objection to form. 21 A. Well, you have all the codes, the cost, 21 MR. CHRISTOFFERSON: What's the basis of 22 claim total, you know. It doesn't give enough 22 your objection?

29 (Pages 110 to 113)

November 17, 2005

## Chicago, IL

Page 114 Page 116 class period, the SMW health fund had paid for MS. CONNOLLY: He said he doesn't know 1 1 portions of pharmaceutical bills that were covered 2 anything about this form, so he's interpreting the 3 in the first instance by Medicare Part B. document as much as you can. 3 Do you see that? THE WITNESS: Again, in common sense from 4 4 the accounting background, you know, total charges 5 A. Uh-huh. 5 6 Q. Did I read that correctly? 6 3,000, Medicare paid 2,000, SMW Plus paid 402 A. I wasn't following it. Start it off. 7 something. 7 Q. Let me try it again. During the class 8 BY MR. CHRISTOFFERSON: 8 period, the SMW health fund has paid for portions of 9 9 Q. But you don't know anything really about pharmaceutical bills that were covered in the first 10 10 this form? instance by Medicare Part B. 11 A. No. I don't get into those details, no. 11 That's what we hire the third-party people for. 12 Did I read that correctly? 12 A. You read it correctly, but it would seem Q. How does the Fund know what drug it's 13 13 reimbursing when it reimburses for a 14 like it should say SMW Plus to me. 14 Q. Fair enough. And is this paragraph, physician-administered drug under this program? 15 15 MS. CONNOLLY: Objection to form. Paragraph 25a, about the Fund of which you're a 16 16 You can answer. 17 trustee, just generally? 17 A. Yes. THE WITNESS: A code number would give 18 18 Q. And then the last sentence says, the drugs them that indication I would assume. 19 19 for which payments were made include Cytoxan, in BY MR. CHRISTOFFERSON: 20 20 parenthesis BMS, Etopophos, parenthesis BMS, Kytril O. And how does the Fund know who 21 21 parenthesis GSK, Levaquin, parenthesis J&J, manufactured any of the drugs that are listed on 22 Page 117 Page 115 Nevelbine, parenthesis GSK, Paraplatin, parenthesis these forms? 1 1 BMS, Procrit, parenthesis J&J, Remicade, parenthesis 2 MS. CONNOLLY: Objection to form. 2 3 J&J, Rubex, parenthesis BMS, Taxol, parenthesis BMS, You can answer. 3 Vepesid, parenthesis BMS, and Zoladex, parenthesis THE WITNESS: I don't know. 4 4 MR. CHRISTOFFERSON: Would you please mark 5 Astro-Zeneca. 5 6 Did I read that correctly? 6 this. 7 7 (Exhibit Randle 007 marked as A. To the best of my knowledge you did. O. First, if you would, what is the 8 8 requested.) 9 significance of the information that's included in 9 BY MR. CHRISTOFFERSON: the parenthesis? Q. Mr. Randle, if you would, could you please 10 10 turn to Page 13 of what the court reporter has 11 MS. CONNOLLY: Objection to form. 11 marked as Exhibit Randle 007. 12 THE WITNESS: It's a further 12 A. This is the original numbering sequence? identification of what they just spoke of would be 13 13 the logic. 14 Q. Yes. 14 BY MR. CHRISTOFFERSON: 15 MS. CONNOLLY: Yes, it's not Bates 15 numbered. 16 O. For example, are you alleging that with respect to the drug Cytoxan that the Fund made BY MR. CHRISTOFFERSON: 17 17 Q. Page 13, and specifically Paragraph 25a. payments for Cytoxan and that the payments for which 18 18 19 A. Uh-huh, all right. 19 they made were the drug that was manufactured by Q. The last sentence says -- well, strike Bristol-Myers Squibb? 20 20 MS. CONNOLLY: Objection to form. 21 that. 21 22 You can answer. 22 The penultimate sentence says, during the

30 (Pages 114 to 117)

particular drug being the lead for that.

just a wild guess from my viewpoint.

What's the basis for that statement?

A. That's one of those swags, I guess. It's

19

20

21

22

November 17, 2005

## Chicago, IL

Page 118 Page 120 THE WITNESS: Logically I guess that's 1 Q. But you don't know? 1 2 A. No. I don't. 2 what they're saying. BY MR. CHRISTOFFERSON: 3 Q. With respect to drugs that are 3 manufactured by several different manufacturers, how 4 O. What's the basis for the claim that the 4 do you know that one particular version of that drug drugs for which the SMW Plus health -- SMW 5 5 was used versus another? 6 6 Wraparound Plus Program made payments for these A. Personally, I don't. I wouldn't know how 7 particular drugs manufactured by these particular 7 to gain that information. 8 defendants? 8 O. And does the Fund know? MS. CONNOLLY: Objection to form. 9 9 A. Sure, I'm sure they do, you know. They're THE WITNESS: Restate that. 10 10 into this business, and I would expect them to know BY MR. CHRISTOFFERSON: 11 11 Q. How do you know that you made payments for 12 every minute detail of the process. 12 Q. But you don't know on what basis they 13 these particular drugs? 13 14 A. Again, our process is a third-party 14 know? A. Education would be my comment. administrator. This coding that we saw in the other 15 15 O. If you would, Mr. Randle, could you please would lead you to know, I think, if it were a drug, 16 16 17 and I assume, maybe there's a separate code not only 17 turn to Page 82, SMW 0082 of Exhibit Randle 006. for the type of medication but for the manufacturer, 18 A. 86? 18 and it could be that there's only one manufacturer Q. I'm sorry, 82. 19 19 20 of a particular drug being the lead for that. 20 A. 82. 21 Q. What steps did you take in preparation for 21 All right. your deposition today to learn the basis for the 22 Q. Just take a minute to look over that. 22 Page 121 Page 119 Do you recognize this document? claims that are made in this with respect to these 1 2 A. Well, I'd say it's a check produced by the 2 particular drugs? Goodlettsville third-party administrator Southern 3 MS. CONNOLLY: Don't talk to him about any 3 Benefits for Sheet Metal Workers National Health conversations you had with me or Jan. 4 4 Fund to this physician, mailed directly to them for 5 THE WITNESS: Your question being what 5 preparations did I make to understand particular 6 411.57. 6 7 7 drugs that were covered? O. And so this is, if I understand you correctly, this is a record of payment that the 8 8 BY MR. CHRISTOFFERSON: 9 sheet metal workers fund made with respect to a 9 Q. Yes, as a 30(b)(6) witness, yes. A. I would say I did not make any preparation 10 particular claim? 10 to pinpoint a drug, product, company, anything like A. That would be my understanding. 11 11 that, you know. That's not a detail that I would 12 Q. Is this a record that is kept in the usual 12 logically deal with. It's just again a course of the Fund's business? 13 13 Medicare-approved process. 14 A. Yes, they keep copies of all checks, 14 disbursement checks. Q. And I think you mentioned that you said 15 15 Q. Did you, when you commissioned either maybe there's a separate code not only for the type 16 16 of medication but for the manufacturer, and it could counsel or whoever it was that was going to be 17 17 searching for and producing these documents for you be that there's only one manufacturer of a 18 18

31 (Pages 118 to 121)

did you request that these documents, the documents

A. I didn't get specific on what to produce,

indicating payment such as this document, be

19

20

21

22

produced?

November 17, 2005

### Chicago, IL

Page 122 Page 124 provider that's indicated by the check/EFT reference so no, I didn't tell them to produce the payment. 1 1 2 Q. Why is it that there are not records of 2 at the top of this page? A. Well, you have the last column says payment with each claim insurance form and Medicare 3 3 provider paid would be what I assume that Remittance Notice that was produced? 4 MS. CONNOLLY: Objection to form. abbreviation to be, so dropping down to the last 5 5 figure, the net, 1624.20 would be my guess. THE WITNESS: Restate. 6 6 7 BY MR. CHRISTOFFERSON: 7 O. That's the amount that the Fund paid or 8 Q. Well, I'll represent to you that there are 8 that Medicare and the Fund paid together? actually very few of the documents indicated or MS. CONNOLLY: Objection to form. 9 9 represented by what appears on Page 82, and I'm 10 THE WITNESS: Restate. 10 11 asking why -- I'm asking whether more of these 11 BY MR. CHRISTOFFERSON: 12 exist. 12 Q. Is it your testimony that 1624.20 is the amount that the Fund paid to this particular 13 A. You know, on this Page 81, it refers to a 13 check EFT number, so it could be an electronic funds provider for the services that were rendered and 14 14 transfer that was done as opposed to a check in some indicated on the preceding health insurance claims 15 15 cases, so it's an either/or would be my guess. 16 forms? 16 Q. I'm sorry to interrupt you. If we could 17 MS. CONNOLLY: Objection to form. 17 just turn back to Page 40, and I'll represent the THE WITNESS: You know, I wouldn't have 18 18 way these were originally produced there were blue 19 knowledge of that for sure. I couldn't state for 19 sheets that separated documents, although I didn't 20 sure that that's correct. reproduce them here with blue. They're separated 21 BY MR. CHRISTOFFERSON: with white sheets. 22 22 Q. Is it possible that this check/EFT number Page 125 Page 123 But Page 40, 41 and 42 appeared I'll is a reference to the amount that Medicare paid to 1 represent to you as a unit between two blue sheets. 2 the provider and not the Fund? 2 MS. CONNOLLY: Objection to form. 3 3 A. All right. THE WITNESS: Restate it. 4 4 Q. And is there a record of payment by the 5 5 Fund that appears in connection with this particular 6 BY MR. CHRISTOFFERSON: 6 set of claims? 7 Q. Is it your testimony that you're certain 7 A. Up in the top left-hand corner, it looks that the amount that this check/EFT reference at the 8 like electronic transfer or check number, and that 8 number appears to be somewhat in the sequence of 9 top of this Page 42 is in reference to an amount 9 that the Fund paid to the provider as opposed to what that other one was as I recall the number, 87 10 11 something. 11 what Medicare paid in terms of its 80 percent that it owed to the provider? Q. So is it your testimony that that 12 12 indicates payment by the Fund where it says MS. CONNOLLY: Objection to form. 13 13 check/EFT number? THE WITNESS: Yeah, certainly, you know, 14 14 couldn't state anything pertaining to that with 15 A. Yes, and as opposed to having duplication 15 certainty, you know. I'm looking at this for the of copies of checks, I would say all those could be 16 16 produced from that number. They would be filed in 17 first time. I've never been in this part of the 17 18 the bank statement. 18 process. 19 Q. And is it your testimony that the amount So I couldn't tell you for sure. That 19 in this particular case that was produced -- excuse 20 would be something Teresa Jernigan --20 me, that was made to the provider -- strike that. 21 BY MR. CHRISTOFFERSON: 21

32 (Pages 122 to 125)

Q. Just to be clear, you don't know, in fact,

22

What was the amount that was paid to the

November 17, 2005

## Chicago, IL

Page 126 Page 128 what this check/EFT is in reference to? 1 Q. What is your understanding of average 1 A. Common sense would tell me it is a check 2 wholesale price? 2 A. You know, it is what its name is as I number or electronic funds transfer reference 3 3 understand it. It's some type of a standard that's 4 number. That's -- I'm taking a guess at that, but 4 that would be the common sense. 5 produced by some group and identified as just that 5 6 average wholesale price. Now, how their sampling is 6 MR. CHRISTOFFERSON: Just for the record done and who is it that does it and whatever I don't 7 Defendants would request that to the extent 7 8 have any knowledge of. 8 documents such as those that appear on SMW 0082, 9 that other documents such as this are in existence, 9 Q. Do you know who calculates average wholesale price? 10 that they be produced to the Defendants to indicate 10 A. No. 11 payment by the Fund in connection with these claims 11 THE WITNESS: 82 or -- okay. 12 Q. Do you know generally how it's used? 12 13 MS. CONNOLLY: Objection to form. MS. CONNOLLY: I'll consider your request. 13 I think we gave you everything, but we will look 14 THE WITNESS: Do you want to restate? 14 BY MR. CHRISTOFFERSON: 15 15 into that. Q. Do you know what the purpose of average 16 BY MR. CHRISTOFFERSON: 16 Q. With respect to the drugs that are listed 17 17 wholesale price is? MS. CONNOLLY: Objection to form. in Paragraph 4 of your affidavit that we discussed 18 18 earlier, were payments made by the Fund for these 19 THE WITNESS: Personally I don't. 19 drugs based on average wholesale price or AWP? 20 BY MR. CHRISTOFFERSON: 20 Q. Does the Fund keep track of the average 21 MS. CONNOLLY: Objection, form. 21 22 wholesale prices of the drugs that it reimburses? 22 THE WITNESS: Do you want to restate? Page 129 Page 127 BY MR. CHRISTOFFERSON: A. Personally, I don't know if they do. 1 1 2 Q. Were the amounts that the Fund paid to 2 Q. Are you familiar with the term wholesale providers under the Wraparound Plus Program for the acquisition cost or WAC, W-A-C? 3 3 4 drugs that you've identified in Paragraph 4, were 4 A. No. those amounts based on average wholesale price of Q. To your knowledge, does the Fund keep 5 5 the drugs that are listed in Paragraph 4? 6 track of wholesale acquisition costs or WACs for the 6 7 7 MS. CONNOLLY: Objection to form. prescription drugs that it reimburses? 8 A. Not to my knowledge. I don't know. 8 You can answer. Q. When did you first learn of this 9 THE WITNESS: All payments were made based 9 litigation? on the Medicare-approved plan form. No other 10 10 criteria was looked at by our third-party A. In the end of 2004 I think, at one of our 11 11 administrator to my knowledge other than, you know, trustee meetings, Jan made us aware of it being out 12 12 you have to go to Medicare to find out that as I there and asked us whether we wanted to --13 13 MS. CONNOLLY: Don't tell him what Jan would see. 14 14 BY MR. CHRISTOFFERSON: 15 15 told you. BY MR. CHRISTOFFERSON: 16 O. Do you know if the average wholesale price 16 of any of the drugs that were reimbursed appears on Q. I believe in your affidavit you said 17 17 any of the documents that were produced by the Fund? December 9th, 2004. 18 18

33 (Pages 126 to 129)

Does that refresh your recollection?

A. It's very possible if that's what I said.

Q. And just to be clear, I think you

testified earlier that you're in the process of

19

20

21

22

MS. CONNOLLY: Objection, form.

process of Medicare. I don't know personally.

BY MR. CHRISTOFFERSON:

THE WITNESS: Only if it's a standard

19

20

21

22

BY MR. CHRISTOFFERSON:

Q. Is the Fund being proposed as a class

November 17, 2005

## Chicago, IL

Page 130 Page 132 identifying healthcare providers based in representative for the -- well, strike that. 1 1 If you would go to Exhibit Randle 007, which Massachusetts to whom the Fund made payments under 2 the Medicare Wraparound Plus Program, is that 3 is the complaint, and if you'd look at the fourth 3 4 accurate? 4 sentence I guess, it says --5 A. I don't know that we're looking at 5 MS. CONNOLLY: I'm sorry, what page? 6 providers. We're looking at claims paid for 6 BY MR. CHRISTOFFERSON: 7 participants that live in Massachusetts as opposed 7 Q. My apologies. We're back on Page 13, to looking at providers. sorry, Paragraph 25a. My apologies. It's the 8 8 9 Q. Just quickly, with respect to Exhibit 9 fourth sentence of that paragraph. It says, the SMW Health Fund provides a Supplemental Medicare 10 Randle 004, Exhibit Randle 004, the plan document, 10 does this plan document cover all of the benefits that Wraparound Plus Program that covers the Medicare 11 11 the Fund provides currently including the wraparound 12 Part B copayments of its beneficiaries. 12 Did I read that correctly? Medicare plus program? 13 13 A. As I stated earlier, there's possibly some 14 14 A. Yes. 15 other amendments that are not on here. I don't know 15 Q. And if you'd turn back to Page 10, do you for sure. That would be my -- it is as far as you see that this paragraph comes under a section 16 16 17 have it here effective January the 1st of 2002, so 17 Number 2, Proposed Class 2 Representative, MediGab Payors? 18 if there were any other amendments, you know, they 18 could be a part of it. 19 19 A. Yes. Now, this amendment here is dated 2005, 20 20 Q. Is the health fund a proposed class 21 November, so it would appear that we're pretty well 21 representative? 22 up to date. 22 MS. CONNOLLY: Objection, form. Page 131 Page 133 MR. CHRISTOFFERSON: Just for the record 1 1 You can answer. 2 because Sheet Metal Workers National Health Fund i 2 THE WITNESS: To my knowledge, it is a 3 only a proposed Class 2 representative and therefore 3 proposed group. 4 only being proposed with respect to claims 4 5 5 copayments, Medicare beneficiary copayments, BY MR. CHRISTOFFERSON: Defendants will not be asking questions related to 6 6 Q. And as a class representative, what are 7 the other benefits that the Fund provides pursuant 7 your responsibilities in a lawsuit of this nature? MS. CONNOLLY: Objection to form. 8 to this plan or other plans, but to the extent that 8 at some point in the future this Fund becomes a 9 9 You can answer. proposed representative for another class, we 10 10 THE WITNESS: Never being a part of one of 11 reserve the right to ask those questions about that, 11 these, I guess I would have to be educated on my about those issues then. responsibilities in that role. I don't know off the 12 12 MS. CONNOLLY: Okay. We will deal with top of my head for sure. 13 13 BY MR. CHRISTOFFERSON: 14 that then. 14 BY MR. CHRISTOFFERSON: 15 Q. And do you know what the class is that you 15 16 O. What do you understand the Fund's role to 16 represent or you're purported to represent? 17 be in this lawsuit? 17 MS. CONNOLLY: Objection to form. MS. CONNOLLY: Objection to form. 18 18 You can answer. 19 19 You can answer. THE WITNESS: It would be multiemployer, 20 THE WITNESS: Restate. 20 you know, MediGap payor groups I would assume, you

34 (Pages 130 to 133)

know. I don't know the details. This is the first

time I've seen this document.

21

November 17, 2005

### Chicago, IL

Page 134 Page 136 BY MR. CHRISTOFFERSON: documents that the Fund was supposed to produce to 1 2 Q. Did you have the -- with respect to 2 Defendants pursuant to the court's order of August 16th, 2005? 3 Paragraph 25a on Page 13, when did you first see 3 this paragraph in this document? MS. CONNOLLY: Don't tell him anything you 4 4 5 5 A. Today. learned from Jan or me. 6 6 Q. So you never had the opportunity to review THE WITNESS: Say the question again. 7 this before it was filed? 7 BY MR. CHRISTOFFERSON: 8 A. There's a document that I've looked at. 8 Q. What's your understanding of the documents that the Fund was required to produce pursuant to 9 It's certainly not this thick, some information that 9 I've looked at. I don't know if this is a the court's order in August? 10 10 11 duplication of that myself. Total recollection of 11 MS. CONNOLLY: Same thing. If you know it what that document said, I don't think so. As I 12 independent of talking to me or Jan, you can 12 said, we had that SMW Plus error there in the mid testify. 13 13 paragraph. That doesn't ring a bell with me. 14 THE WITNESS: To my knowledge, just claim 14 Q. Do you know when you reviewed this other 15 forms, paid claims. 15 document that you're talking about? 16 BY MR. CHRISTOFFERSON: 16 A. In the last two or three weeks. 17 Q. We have already discussed, or you've 17 Q. Do you know if it was after October 17th? already testified I should say, that you requested 18 18 these documents from the third-party administrator. A. That I reviewed it, probably. 19 19 A. For them to produce. Q. Did you make changes, any changes to that 20 20 document? 21 Q. For them to produce. 21 22 Did you request any documents from A. No. 22 Page 135 Page 137 Medicare? 1 Q. What are the claims that the Fund is 2 asserting against the Defendant drug manufacturers? 2 A. No. 3 MS. CONNOLLY: Objection to form. 3 Q. Did you request any documents from any of your participants? 4 You can answer. 4 5 THE WITNESS: Restate it. 5 A. No. 6 BY MR. CHRISTOFFERSON: 6 Q. And I think you testified earlier that Q. What claims are you asserting, and by you you're still looking for documents in conducting 7 7 8 I mean the Fund, asserting against the Defendants in 8 your search? 9 this litigation? 9 A. Yes. They're filed chronologically, so we're in this software update and doing that and MS. CONNOLLY: Objection to form. 10 11 You can answer. 11 looking for these at the same time. Q. Other than our conversations here today, THE WITNESS: For any overcharge relating 12 12 to physician-administered drugs for any of our has the Fund ever had any written or oral 13 communications with any of the Defendants or 14 participants. BY MR. CHRISTOFFERSON: representatives of the Defendants? 15 15 Q. And overcharged by whom? 16 A. Not to my knowledge. 16 17 A. By the provider, whomever it would be. I 17 Q. How was the Fund harmed by the Defendants? MS. CONNOLLY: Objection to form. understand that some of these drugs are -- well, the 18 18 physicians for the most part administers, are 19 THE WITNESS: Do you want to restate? 19 20 administering the drugs, so I guess they would be 20 BY MR. CHRISTOFFERSON: the provider. 21 Q. In this lawsuit, you're suing the 21 Q. What is your understanding of the 22 22 Defendants.

35 (Pages 134 to 137)

November 17, 2005

## Chicago, IL

Page 138 Page 140 How is it that the Fund was harmed by overcharge. 1 1 2 BY MR. CHRISTOFFERSON: 2 those Defendants such that you're suing for 3 Q. Who are the attorneys that represent you 3 recovery? 4 in this action? MS. CONNOLLY: Objection to form. 4 5 A. Well, you know, Jan Jennings is involved 5 You can answer. 6 with this process, Jennifer and their firm here. 6 THE WITNESS: In my viewpoint, the 7 7 participants were harmed, you know. These are The names -fixed-income people that their cost to this Fund is 8 O. Wexler? 8 9 dependent upon our expense, which our expense comes 9 A. The Wexler. from those providers providing the services and O. The Wexler Firm? 10 10 A. The Wexler Firm. drugs and whatever. 11 11 So they were harmed in the fact of any 12 Q. Do you have an engagement letter with The 12 Wexler Firm? overpayment for services or drugs going into the 13 13 A. No. 14 formula that we as trustees set as their rate, no 14 different than we looked at the \$56 in whatever year 15 Q. Are you paying any amount in connection 15 with this case to your attorneys? 16 that was, now being 112, double. 16 17 BY MR. CHRISTOFFERSON: 17 18 MR. CHRISTOFFERSON: Could we take a quick Q. Does the Fund contend that it suffered 18 harm from Defendants who manufactured drugs for 19 break? 19 which the Fund did not make any reimbursement 20 MS. CONNOLLY: Yes. 20 21 payment? 21 (Whereupon, a short recess was 22 22 MS. CONNOLLY: Objection to form. taken.) Page 139 Page 141 1 MR. CHRISTOFFERSON: I'm going to pass the 1 THE WITNESS: Restate that. 2 BY MR. CHRISTOFFERSON: 2 witness in just a moment to Mr. Sweeney, but I just 3 wanted to make a statement for the record. 3 Q. If there are -- strike that. 4 Is it the Fund's contention that it 4 Upon the completion of Mr. Sweeney's suffered harm caused by the Defendants including 5 questions, the Track 1 Defendants will be adjourning 5 Defendants who manufacture drugs for which the Fund 6 this deposition and bringing to Judge Saris' 6 7 did not actually make any payment to a provider? 7 attention the lack of documentation provided to MS. CONNOLLY: Objection to form. 8 substantiate the qualifications of Sheet Metal 8 THE WITNESS: To my knowledge, no. 9 Workers Health and Welfare Fund as an adequate class 9 representative, which was required by the court's BY MR. CHRISTOFFERSON: 10 10 August 16th, 2005 order. We will resume the 11 Q. And what is the Fund seeking from this 11 lawsuit? deposition after receiving more documents if 12 12 Judge Saris permits the Fund to become a class 13 MS. CONNOLLY: Objection to form. 13 representative. 14 You can answer. 14 15 THE WITNESS: Well, a settlement in the 15 In addition, the Track 1 Defendants also overcharge for these drugs that come back and help 16 reserve the right to resume this deposition on the topics to which Mr. Randle was not designated to 17 reduce the cost of the participants' cost of 17 testify if and when the Fund is ruled to be an coverage is what we're wanting, and, you know, I 18 18 qualify this by participants. It's not -- the Fund 19 adequate class representative by the court. 19 MS. CONNOLLY: Just as I'm sure you know, 20 is that invisible thing. It's the individual 20 participants that were harmed and should receive 21 we disagree about your characterization about the reduced costs because of any monies received from document production, and we will also oppose any

36 (Pages 138 to 141)

November 17, 2005

#### Chicago, IL

Page 142 Page 144 subsequent deposition of the Fund. A. Teresa Jernigan. 1 1 But we will deal with that when it comes. 2 2 Q. Okay. Anybody else? **EXAMINATION** 3 A. Well, you know, anyone at Southern Benefit 3 Administrator, but she's the head of this Fund. BY MR. SWEENEY: 4 4 5 Q. Sir, I have a few questions. We met 5 Q. If you had a question about these forms, before. My name is Tom Sweeney from the firm of 6 that's who you would turn to? 6 Hogan & Hartson, and I represent BMS, Apothecon and 7 7 A. Teresa. Q. Teresa? OTN. I will not delay you too long. 8 8 I think in your testimony you referred to 9 9 A. Yes. the Fund as self-funded? Q. Okay. Take a look at Exhibit Randle 003, 10 10 A. Yes. which is the 2003 Summary Plan Description. 11 11 Q. What does that mean, sir? 12 12 A. Yes. A. We accumulate income based on past history O. I just have one question, which is look at 13 13 14 of expenses, and we're not a profit-making 14 the top of the page in the fax line. organization basically. We're trying to provide 15 A. Uh-huh. 15 Q. There's a reference to healthcare coverage for the participants at a cost. 16 16 17 Q. Do the employers make contributions to the 17 Branstetter Kilgore. Fund? A. Yes. 18 18 A. Yes. Their union agreement tells them the Q. Who is Branstetter Kilgore? 19 19 A. That's Jan's firm. 20 rate. 20 21 Q. Okay. Does the -- do the union members 21 Q. Mr. Jennings' firm? make contributions to the Fund? 22 22 A. Uh-huh. Page 143 Page 145 A. If they're out of work at a particular 1 O. That's a law firm? 1 2 A. Yes. 2 time, there is some self-funding that can be done. 3 Q. Now, just to clarify something that you 3 Q. So part of their union dues go to the discussed with Mr. Christofferson earlier, is it 4 Fund? 4 correct that before Southern Benefit was hired as 5 A. No, they have to physically pay if -- if 5 their hour bank runs out, their accumulated hour 6 the TPA for the Fund that the Fund was administered 6 7 7 bank, if their hour bank runs out, they have to pay by the Sheet Metal Workers Pension Fund? monthly out of their funds. 8 A. Employees common to the pension fund and 8 9 the health and welfare, they shared a group of 9 Q. What do you mean? Was it our bank? employees that was the administrator for both. A. Hour, h-o-u-r. They accumulate so many 10 10 Q. Okay. And that goes back to the beginning 11 hours. I forget exactly what level it goes to. 11 Q. And in addition to that at least for the of the wraparound plan as you understand it? 12 12 wraparound fund, there's an additional monthly 13 A. Yes. 13 payment that each of the participants has to make? Q. Okay. Now, Mr. Christofferson asked you 14 14

> copayments and deductibles, I believe, and it was 18 your testimony as I understood it that at some point

some questions about the optional employees plan --

Q. -- and whether you covered Medicare

that that coverage for optional employees was 20

21 eliminated; is that correct?

A. Yes.

22 A. As they qualified for Medicare.

37 (Pages 142 to 145)

15

16

A. Yes. And I was speaking to you on actives

Q. Would you take a look at Exhibit Randle 006,17

there. On this SMW Plus, it's just that flat fee.

Is it fair to say, sir, that you're not

the right person to talk to about these forms?

which is the claim forms.

A. Absolutely.

Q. Who is?

15

16 17

18

19

20

21

November 17, 2005

# Chicago, IL

	Page 146		Page 148
1	Q. Right. Why was that coverage eliminated	1	
2	by the Fund?	2	
3	A. I think the costs.	3	
4	Q. You were involved in that decision?	4	
5	A. Yes, uh-huh.	5	
6	MR. SWEENEY: That's all the questions I	6	GLENN RANDLE
7	have.	7	
8	MS. CONNOLLY: I just have two follow-up	8	Subscribed and sworn to and before me
9	questions.	9	this, 20
10	EXAMINATION	10	
11	BY MS. CONNOLLY:	11	
12	Q. Mr. Randle, you previously testified in	12	A Section Control of C
13	response to Mr. Christofferson's question that the	13	Notary Public
14	Fund believed that it was suing the providers.	14	
15	What did you mean by that?	15	
16	A. Well, of course, this suit is against the	16	
17	pharmaceutical companies in actual fact. The	17	
18	providers, I guess in my mind, provide that in the	18	
19	chain of their billings and everything.	19	
20	So, you know, the pharmaceutical companies	20	
21	and the overcharge for drugs was who we're the	21	
22	bottom line suing, I'd say.	22	
	Page 147		Page 149
1	Q. You understand that as a class	1	STATE OF ILLINOIS )
2	representative that you are required to be here and	2	) SS:
3	give your deposition today, right?	3	COUNTY OF COOK)
3 4	A. Yes.	4	The within and foregoing deposition of the
3 4 5	<ul><li>A. Yes.</li><li>Q. You also understand that you're required</li></ul>	<b>4</b> 5	The within and foregoing deposition of the witness, GLENN RANDLE, was taken before GREG S.
3 4 5 6	<ul><li>A. Yes.</li><li>Q. You also understand that you're required to cooperate with your lawyers in producing</li></ul>	4 5 6	The within and foregoing deposition of the witness, GLENN RANDLE, was taken before GREG S. WEILAND, CSR, RMR, CRR, Notary Public, at Suite 2000,
3 4 5 6 7	A. Yes. Q. You also understand that you're required to cooperate with your lawyers in producing documents to the Defendants, right?	4 5 6 7	The within and foregoing deposition of the witness, GLENN RANDLE, was taken before GREG S. WEILAND, CSR, RMR, CRR, Notary Public, at Suite 2000, One North LaSalle Street, in the City of Chicago, Cook
3 4 5 6 7 8	A. Yes. Q. You also understand that you're required to cooperate with your lawyers in producing documents to the Defendants, right? A. Yes.	4 5 6 7 8	The within and foregoing deposition of the witness, GLENN RANDLE, was taken before GREG S. WEILAND, CSR, RMR, CRR, Notary Public, at Suite 2000, One North LaSalle Street, in the City of Chicago, Cook County, Illinois, commencing at 8:11 o'clock a.m., on
3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. You also understand that you're required to cooperate with your lawyers in producing documents to the Defendants, right?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And you understand that if this case</li> </ul>	4 5 6 7 8 9	The within and foregoing deposition of the witness, GLENN RANDLE, was taken before GREG S. WEILAND, CSR, RMR, CRR, Notary Public, at Suite 2000, One North LaSalle Street, in the City of Chicago, Cook County, Illinois, commencing at 8:11 o'clock a.m., on the 17th day of November, 2005.
3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. You also understand that you're required to cooperate with your lawyers in producing documents to the Defendants, right?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And you understand that if this case should go to trial that you might be required to</li> </ul>	4 5 6 7 8 9	The within and foregoing deposition of the witness, GLENN RANDLE, was taken before GREG S. WEILAND, CSR, RMR, CRR, Notary Public, at Suite 2000, One North LaSalle Street, in the City of Chicago, Cook County, Illinois, commencing at 8:11 o'clock a.m., on the 17th day of November, 2005.  The said witness was first duly sworn and
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	A. Yes. Q. You also understand that you're required to cooperate with your lawyers in producing documents to the Defendants, right? A. Yes. Q. And you understand that if this case should go to trial that you might be required to testify at trial, correct?	4 5 6 7 8 9 10	The within and foregoing deposition of the witness, GLENN RANDLE, was taken before GREG S. WEILAND, CSR, RMR, CRR, Notary Public, at Suite 2000, One North LaSalle Street, in the City of Chicago, Cook County, Illinois, commencing at 8:11 o'clock a.m., on the 17th day of November, 2005.  The said witness was first duly sworn and was then examined upon oral interrogatories; the
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	A. Yes. Q. You also understand that you're required to cooperate with your lawyers in producing documents to the Defendants, right? A. Yes. Q. And you understand that if this case should go to trial that you might be required to testify at trial, correct? A. Yes.	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	The within and foregoing deposition of the witness, GLENN RANDLE, was taken before GREG S. WEILAND, CSR, RMR, CRR, Notary Public, at Suite 2000, One North LaSalle Street, in the City of Chicago, Cook County, Illinois, commencing at 8:11 o'clock a.m., on the 17th day of November, 2005.  The said witness was first duly sworn and was then examined upon oral interrogatories; the questions and answers were taken down in shorthand
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	A. Yes. Q. You also understand that you're required to cooperate with your lawyers in producing documents to the Defendants, right? A. Yes. Q. And you understand that if this case should go to trial that you might be required to testify at trial, correct? A. Yes. MS. CONNOLLY: I have nothing further.	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	The within and foregoing deposition of the witness, GLENN RANDLE, was taken before GREG S. WEILAND, CSR, RMR, CRR, Notary Public, at Suite 2000, One North LaSalle Street, in the City of Chicago, Cook County, Illinois, commencing at 8:11 o'clock a.m., on the 17th day of November, 2005.  The said witness was first duly sworn and was then examined upon oral interrogatories; the questions and answers were taken down in shorthand by the undersigned, acting as stenographer and Notary
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	A. Yes. Q. You also understand that you're required to cooperate with your lawyers in producing documents to the Defendants, right? A. Yes. Q. And you understand that if this case should go to trial that you might be required to testify at trial, correct? A. Yes. MS. CONNOLLY: I have nothing further. MR. CHRISTOFFERSON: I have nothing	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	The within and foregoing deposition of the witness, GLENN RANDLE, was taken before GREG S. WEILAND, CSR, RMR, CRR, Notary Public, at Suite 2000, One North LaSalle Street, in the City of Chicago, Cook County, Illinois, commencing at 8:11 o'clock a.m., on the 17th day of November, 2005.  The said witness was first duly sworn and was then examined upon oral interrogatories; the questions and answers were taken down in shorthand by the undersigned, acting as stenographer and Notary Public; and the within and foregoing is a true,
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. You also understand that you're required to cooperate with your lawyers in producing documents to the Defendants, right?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And you understand that if this case should go to trial that you might be required to testify at trial, correct?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>MS. CONNOLLY: I have nothing further. MR. CHRISTOFFERSON: I have nothing further.</li> </ul>	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	The within and foregoing deposition of the witness, GLENN RANDLE, was taken before GREG S. WEILAND, CSR, RMR, CRR, Notary Public, at Suite 2000, One North LaSalle Street, in the City of Chicago, Cook County, Illinois, commencing at 8:11 o'clock a.m., on the 17th day of November, 2005.  The said witness was first duly sworn and was then examined upon oral interrogatories; the questions and answers were taken down in shorthand by the undersigned, acting as stenographer and Notary Public; and the within and foregoing is a true, accurate and complete record of all the questions
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	A. Yes. Q. You also understand that you're required to cooperate with your lawyers in producing documents to the Defendants, right? A. Yes. Q. And you understand that if this case should go to trial that you might be required to testify at trial, correct? A. Yes. MS. CONNOLLY: I have nothing further. MR. CHRISTOFFERSON: I have nothing further. MR. SWEENEY: No further questions.	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	The within and foregoing deposition of the witness, GLENN RANDLE, was taken before GREG S. WEILAND, CSR, RMR, CRR, Notary Public, at Suite 2000, One North LaSalle Street, in the City of Chicago, Cook County, Illinois, commencing at 8:11 o'clock a.m., on the 17th day of November, 2005.  The said witness was first duly sworn and was then examined upon oral interrogatories; the questions and answers were taken down in shorthand by the undersigned, acting as stenographer and Notary Public; and the within and foregoing is a true, accurate and complete record of all the questions asked of and answers made by the aforementioned
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	A. Yes. Q. You also understand that you're required to cooperate with your lawyers in producing documents to the Defendants, right? A. Yes. Q. And you understand that if this case should go to trial that you might be required to testify at trial, correct? A. Yes. MS. CONNOLLY: I have nothing further. MR. CHRISTOFFERSON: I have nothing further. MR. SWEENEY: No further questions. THE WITNESS: Okay.	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	The within and foregoing deposition of the witness, GLENN RANDLE, was taken before GREG S. WEILAND, CSR, RMR, CRR, Notary Public, at Suite 2000, One North LaSalle Street, in the City of Chicago, Cook County, Illinois, commencing at 8:11 o'clock a.m., on the 17th day of November, 2005.  The said witness was first duly sworn and was then examined upon oral interrogatories; the questions and answers were taken down in shorthand by the undersigned, acting as stenographer and Notary Public; and the within and foregoing is a true, accurate and complete record of all the questions asked of and answers made by the aforementioned witness at the time and place hereinabove referred to.
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	A. Yes. Q. You also understand that you're required to cooperate with your lawyers in producing documents to the Defendants, right? A. Yes. Q. And you understand that if this case should go to trial that you might be required to testify at trial, correct? A. Yes. MS. CONNOLLY: I have nothing further. MR. CHRISTOFFERSON: I have nothing further. MR. SWEENEY: No further questions. THE WITNESS: Okay. (Whereupon, an off-the-record	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	The within and foregoing deposition of the witness, GLENN RANDLE, was taken before GREG S. WEILAND, CSR, RMR, CRR, Notary Public, at Suite 2000, One North LaSalle Street, in the City of Chicago, Cook County, Illinois, commencing at 8:11 o'clock a.m., on the 17th day of November, 2005.  The said witness was first duly sworn and was then examined upon oral interrogatories; the questions and answers were taken down in shorthand by the undersigned, acting as stenographer and Notary Public; and the within and foregoing is a true, accurate and complete record of all the questions asked of and answers made by the aforementioned witness at the time and place hereinabove referred to.  The signature of the witness was not waived
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	A. Yes. Q. You also understand that you're required to cooperate with your lawyers in producing documents to the Defendants, right? A. Yes. Q. And you understand that if this case should go to trial that you might be required to testify at trial, correct? A. Yes. MS. CONNOLLY: I have nothing further. MR. CHRISTOFFERSON: I have nothing further. MR. SWEENEY: No further questions. THE WITNESS: Okay. (Whereupon, an off-the-record discussion was held.)	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	The within and foregoing deposition of the witness, GLENN RANDLE, was taken before GREG S. WEILAND, CSR, RMR, CRR, Notary Public, at Suite 2000, One North LaSalle Street, in the City of Chicago, Cook County, Illinois, commencing at 8:11 o'clock a.m., on the 17th day of November, 2005.  The said witness was first duly sworn and was then examined upon oral interrogatories; the questions and answers were taken down in shorthand by the undersigned, acting as stenographer and Notary Public; and the within and foregoing is a true, accurate and complete record of all the questions asked of and answers made by the aforementioned witness at the time and place hereinabove referred to.  The signature of the witness was not waived and the deposition was submitted to the deponent as
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	A. Yes. Q. You also understand that you're required to cooperate with your lawyers in producing documents to the Defendants, right? A. Yes. Q. And you understand that if this case should go to trial that you might be required to testify at trial, correct? A. Yes. MS. CONNOLLY: I have nothing further. MR. CHRISTOFFERSON: I have nothing further. MR. SWEENEY: No further questions. THE WITNESS: Okay. (Whereupon, an off-the-record discussion was held.) MS. CONNOLLY: We reserve signature.	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	The within and foregoing deposition of the witness, GLENN RANDLE, was taken before GREG S. WEILAND, CSR, RMR, CRR, Notary Public, at Suite 2000, One North LaSalle Street, in the City of Chicago, Cook County, Illinois, commencing at 8:11 o'clock a.m., on the 17th day of November, 2005.  The said witness was first duly sworn and was then examined upon oral interrogatories; the questions and answers were taken down in shorthand by the undersigned, acting as stenographer and Notary Public; and the within and foregoing is a true, accurate and complete record of all the questions asked of and answers made by the aforementioned witness at the time and place hereinabove referred to.  The signature of the witness was not waived and the deposition was submitted to the deponent as per copy of the attached letter.
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	A. Yes. Q. You also understand that you're required to cooperate with your lawyers in producing documents to the Defendants, right? A. Yes. Q. And you understand that if this case should go to trial that you might be required to testify at trial, correct? A. Yes. MS. CONNOLLY: I have nothing further. MR. CHRISTOFFERSON: I have nothing further. MR. SWEENEY: No further questions. THE WITNESS: Okay. (Whereupon, an off-the-record discussion was held.)	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	The within and foregoing deposition of the witness, GLENN RANDLE, was taken before GREG S. WEILAND, CSR, RMR, CRR, Notary Public, at Suite 2000, One North LaSalle Street, in the City of Chicago, Cook County, Illinois, commencing at 8:11 o'clock a.m., on the 17th day of November, 2005.  The said witness was first duly sworn and was then examined upon oral interrogatories; the questions and answers were taken down in shorthand by the undersigned, acting as stenographer and Notary Public; and the within and foregoing is a true, accurate and complete record of all the questions asked of and answers made by the aforementioned witness at the time and place hereinabove referred to.  The signature of the witness was not waived and the deposition was submitted to the deponent as

38 (Pages 146 to 149)

November 17, 2005

# Chicago, IL

	Page 150	
1 2 3 4 5	parties.  Witness my official signature and seal as Notary Public in and for Cook County, Illinois, on this 1st day of December, 2005.	
6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	GREG S. WEILAND, CSR, RMR, CRR License No. 084-003472	
19 20 21 22		

39 (Page 150)